App. F. IX-4

1930-31
Law

File No. 38-30

Previous References
Law 1155-29 1-2

Serial Nos. 144.

Later References
Law 3-33-27 & 28

(7)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 450.

Part B for Dec 1930

SUBJECT.

Bill for Rs 750/- being the remuneration of the
P. P. Mysore for Secrets rendered this no 539-29-30
(Govt of Sirsi)

---

4. Secy 2477-81 of 4.11.30
Sanction the bill

Rs 14/12/30

G. R. S. APP F. III—1] 1930

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Law)

NOTES.

File No. 38

FILE HEADING.

Remuneration to Public Prosecutor Mysore

FROM District Magistrate

No. G.3.263/30-31 Dated 26th Aug 1930 Received 1st Sept 30

Diary No. 1163	Enclos.	Spare copies	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Submitting for sanction a bill duly signed by the City Magr for services rendered by the PPr Mysore in Mis Trl No 53 of 1929-30 (Govt vs V.V. Giri). The Dist. Magr recommends for a lumpsum fee of Rs 750/- as a special case in view of the difficult nature of the case and its importance, and states that the success of the case was due to the hard work of the PPr.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Subject

The City Magistrate Mysore in his Certificate of attendance speaks highly of the services of the PPr, for having Conducted the Case with great ability and tactfulness. The Dist Magr has put it in a nutshell by saying that the Success in the Case was due as much to the hard work of the PPr as to the police The remuneration now recommended

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 01683—GPB—5,000—3-5-29

General and Revenue Secretariat File No. 38 of 1930

Serial No.

by the Dist. Mag[te] is almost ~~is~~ double the amount that is ordinarily allowed according the rules. The total number of Hearings as shown in the list of service rendered ~~is~~ are 20 and that of adjournments is about 5. The remuneration that is ordinarily allowed would be Rs 345/- whereas a lumpsum fee of Rs 750/- has been recommended. No doubt Case seems to be of a Complicated nature and the work that was expected from the Ppr being more than the average. Under such Circumstances the Ppr deserve enhanced fee for orders.

ISD
3/6

Under the rules the Ppr Ukpong can get Rs 345/- for the work done. The Dt magistrate recommends payment of a fee of Rs 750/- on account of the importance of the Case as also the additional work that was done by the Ppr during the investigation Cases.

The budget grant under 18 '2 cls of Law fees to Advocates is already exhausted and an additional grant is inevitable. This Case against Mr Gisi being Connected with the Rly Dept. under rule 130 of the Legal Affairs Rules, that Department has to bear the Charge. The Ind fees may,

NOTE:—Contn. Sheet

WD 02553—50,000—GPB—8-7 30

File No. of 193 General and Revenue Secretariat

Perhaps be consulted.

Legal R^y

M 4.9

D. M. 19

Forwarded with Compts

As this is apparently a Ry. case, it is perhaps

matter for enquiry

D. 13.9.30

X950

D 1169/30

3306.

16.9

I have no objection to the Ry Dept bearing the charge - It is desirable to consult the Ry Secy also -

17.9.30.

DSD 18/9

Secy

Government of Mysore.

24 SEP.

D. No. 22.0.No. 8

D. M. 19 = G.O.No. P229 30

Forwarded No., with Compliments, dated 23rd Sept. 1930

to the Railway Secretary for favour of opinion.

B. Mahadevappa

Law Secy & Legal Adviser

19.9.30.

DSD 19/9.

3

1163
P

Ry. F 4]

Railway Secretariat. | File No. | of 193

U.O.No:8
96/T/30

Serial No.

Rly F

Returned, with compliments, to the Law Secretary to Government.

According to para 130 of the Legal Affairs Rules, the charges should no doubt be borne by the Department to which the Proceedings relate. But the action on Mr.Giri was instituted by the Police not only in the interest of Railway Department but also in the interests of public peace and tranquilli-ty and it is but reasonable that at least a portion of the expenditure should be borne by the Civil Department. As apparently there is no sufficient provision in the Civil Budget vide notes of the Legal Remembrancer one half of the expenditure will be borne by this Department as the provision for Law Charges of the Railway Department is also limited.

Secretary for Railways
Government of Mysore
4th October 1930.

Laws 6/10

OFFICE OF THE
SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
30 CT. 1930
No. 3509

Draft G.O. put up for approval. 16/10
Perhaps the Finance may be consulted before issue.

Legal R

17.10

Finance

2nd Member.

Issue my 31/10

X1444
29/10/30

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 2253—GPB—7,000—12-1-30

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 192 .

Serial No.

2 - Conf. 961

4.11.30.

Financial Secy. has agreed.

Draft-Ghair Rule.

WW 4/11

Law

A.G. 4.11.30

Communicate

G.O. No. P. 2677-81 / Law 38&30-4 dated 4th Nov 1930 Sanctioning Rs 750/- being the Remuneration for the services rendered by the Pvr. Mysore in Mis. No. 53 of 29-30 (Govt vs V.V. Giri) & debiting half the expenditure to "18-2 Ch of Law. Fee to Advocates etc".

B & S

ISO 7/11 B

WD 021—GPB—30,000—21-8-28

1163 P 1930.

No. G3. 263/30-31.
Encl 1.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Dated Mysore, 26th August 1930. *192*

Law 386-30-1

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
District Magistrate,
Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of His Highness the Maharaja of
Mysore, Law Departments,
Bangalore.

P. 1163

SIR,

I have the honour to submit herewith a bill duly countersigned by the City Magistrate, Mysore, for services rendered by the Public Prosecutor in Mis. No.53 of 1929-30 (Government Vs. Mr. V. V. Giri) on the file of the City Magistrate, Mysore, and to state as follows:-

Sanction was accorded by Government in their order No. P. 6123-4/Law. 155-29 dated 8th/9th May 1930 for engaging the services of the Public Prosecutor, Mysore, to appear on behalf of the Government in the cases against Mr. V. V. Giri on the file of the City Magistrate's Court, Mysore. The Public Prosecutor accordingly attended the Court on 25 hearings At 20 hearings the case was tried but on 5 days the case was not tried but ~~was~~ adjourned. The remuneration payable to him at the ordinary rates would be Rs. 345/-; but the ordinary rates of fees are not suitable in this case. In view of the difficult nature of the case, and of its importance, the Public Prosecutor ~~who~~ was consulted even during the investigation by the Police. In fact, throughout the investigation, the Public Prosecutor was in daily touch with the Police and advising them as to the facts to be proved, the effect of evidence collected etc. This involved a heavy amount of work.

The success in the case was due as much to the ~~hard~~ hard work of the Public Prosecutor as to the Police. As it was a difficult case and as he had to work throughout the summer vacation

vacation in connection with this case, I consider that a lumpsum fee of Rs. 750/- may be granted to him for having successfully conducted the case. I request that sanction of Government may kindly be obtained for payment of a remuneration of Rs. 750/- to the Public Prosecutor for the work done by him in connection with this case.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Chairman

District Magistrate,

NRS Mysore District.

2

Law 38-30-4

Read.

Letter no: G3. 263/30-31 dated 26th August 1930 forwarding a bill of the Public Prosecutor, Mysore duly countersigned by the City Magistrate, for services rendered in His no: 53 of 1929-30 (Govt vs Mr V.V. Giri) and recommending that in view of the difficult nature of the case & its importance, a lump sum fee of Rs. 750/- may be sanctioned to be paid to the Public Prosecutor.

4/11/30

Sd) Mr ~~Ab~~ N. Sivaraz

Order: P 2477-81

Sanctioned. one half of the Expenditure ~~will be~~ be borne by the Railway department and the ~~Railway~~ Agent, Mysore Railways ~~Secretary~~ is requested to point out the source direct to the Comptroller - The other half of the ~~expenditure~~ expenditure ~~is~~ will ~~be~~ be debited to 15-2-Courts of Law fees to Advocates etc, to be supplemented in due course by an additional grant, pending which the Comptroller is requested to pay the amount sanctioned.

Dy 3/11

To

1) Agent Mysore Rys
2) The Dy Secy Mysore with the bill
3) The PP Mysore
4) Comptroller thro' Test Secty
5) Secy to Govt, Mysore Railways.

Secy to Govt.
Law Dept

3

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

R e a d--

Letter No.G.3-263/30-31 dated 26th August 1930. forwarding a bill of the Public Prosecutor, Mysore duly countersigned by the City Magistrate, for services rendered in His.No. 53 of 1929-30 (Government Vs. V.V. Giri) and recommending that in view of the difficult nature of the case and its importance. a lump sum fee of Rs.750/- may be sanctioned to be paid to the Public Prosecutor.

O r d e r,No. P2477-81/ Law 38-30-4

Dated, Bangalore/the November 1930.

Sanctioned. One half of the expenditure will be borne by the Railway Department and the Agent, Mysore Railways is requested to point out the source direct to the Comptroller. The other half of the expenditure will be debited to head 16-2 Courts of Law Fees to Advocates etc. to be supplemented in due course by an additional grant, pending which the Comptroller is requested to pay the amount sanctioned.

N Sanmugam

For Secretary to Government,

Law Department.

TSD

To

The Agent, Mysore Railways.
The District Magistrate, Mysore with the Bill.
The Public Prosecutor, Mysore.
The Comptroller to Govt., through Financial Secty.
The Secretary to Government, Mysore Railways.

Tb.